

DUKE POWER COMPANY
POWER BUILDING
422 SOUTH CHURCH STREET, CHARLOTTE, N. C. 28201

A. C. THIES
SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT
PRODUCTION AND TRANSMISSION

P. O. Box 2178

May 19, 1981

Mr. Harold R. Denton, Director
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Attention: Ms. E. G. Adensam, Chief
Licensing Branch No. 4

Re: McGuire Nuclear Station, Unit 1
Docket No. 50-369

Dear Mr. Denton:

Attached are proposed changes to the McGuire Nuclear Station, Unit 1, Technical Specifications. These changes include the following items:

1. Revised response times and test current values for selected circuit breakers.
2. Deletion of isolation valves from categorization as containment isolation valves.
3. Exemption request for selected hydraulic snubbers from periodic functional testing requirement.
4. Alternate method for verifying that certain ECCS pumps are not operable under shutdown conditions.
5. Revised value of interlock for isolation of Residual Heat Removal System from Reactor Coolant System.

Each of these items has been reviewed and it has been determined that there are no adverse safety or environmental impacts associated with the proposed changes.

Very truly yours,

A. C. Thies

A. C. Thies

ACT:pw
Attachment

cc: Ms. M. J. Graham
Resident Inspector
McGuire Nuclear Station

Mr. James P. O'Reilly, Director
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Region II



Bools
1/1
ADD: LE
M VIRGILIO
R STEVENS
E HENNINGER
F ORR
J RULSIPHER

8105210314

Mr. Harold R. Denton, Director
May 19, 1981
Page Two

A. C. THIES, being duly sworn, states that he is Senior Vice President of Duke Power Company; that he is authorized on the part of said Company to sign and file with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission this revision to the McGuire Nuclear Station Technical Specifications, Appendix A to License No. NPF-9; and that all statements and matters set forth therein are true and correct to the best of his knowledge.

A. C. Thies
A. C. Thies, Senior Vice President

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 19th day of May, 1981.

Sue C. Merrill
Notary Public

My Commission Expires:

September 20, 1984

ATTACHMENT 1

Technical Specification 3/4.8.3 - Electrical Equipment Protective Devices

Proposed Change

Revise response times and test current values for selected containment penetration conductor overcurrent protection devices in Table 3.8-1 as shown on Attachment 1A. Also revise 4.8.3.1 a.2. as indicated in Attachment 1B to reflect changes in Table 3.8-1.

Justification and Safety Analysis

The proposed change involves changing the response times for molded case circuit breakers. The values of response times in the Technical Specification currently reflect the time required for a circuit breaker to open when a test current equal to 200% of the nominal continuous rating of the breaker is injected. The manufacturer recommends using a test current equal to 300% of the nominal continuous rating for testing. Using this 300% value requires that the response time acceptance criteria be lowered to account for the increased current.

In addition to lowering the response time acceptance criteria, it is proposed that only the maximum acceptable response time be listed in Table 3.8-1 rather than a range of response times. Incorporation of these proposed changes will enhance the testability of these circuit breakers and bring the testing into conformance with the manufacturer's recommendations.

Testing the response time of the molded case circuit breakers provides some level of assurance that these breakers would operate as required in the event of an overcurrent condition and thereby protect the containment electrical penetration associated with the breaker. The response time of a breaker of this type will vary depending on the magnitude of the overcurrent to which it is subjected; a very large overcurrent would result in an "instantaneous" breaker trip whereas a slight overcurrent condition would require an extended period of time for breaker trip. For testing purposes it is impractical to use very large test currents so nominal values are used to check the trip feature. Increasing the test current value from 200% of breaker continuous rating to 300% and decreasing the response time accordingly simply shifts the test point on the response time vs. overcurrent curve.

From the standpoint of containment electrical penetration protection, the minimum response time for breaker trip is unnecessary. The important parameter is the maximum allowable response time, i.e., penetration protection is assured as long as the maximum response time is not exceeded.